UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Wanted: A New Word

By ZONA GALE

Can We Test for Ethical Superiority?

By CLARENCE R. SKINNER

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

Chapter XIV. By M. K. GANDHI

War Guilt Again!

Book Reviews by JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

VOLUME XCIX NUMBER 20

Chicago, July 12, 1926

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. G. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 85 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Francis L. Rossiter, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—F. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lusidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoha
RUSSIA—Alina Huebach

UNITY PUBLISHING Co., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

MAHATMA GANDHI

has written his Autobiography entitled

"THE STORY OF MY EXPERIMENTS WITH TRUTH"

This will appear in regular weekly installments in

UNITY

Subscribe Now

Special subscription offer — $1 for six months beginning April 5th.

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.
Gentlemen:
Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for six months.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss).....

Address .....

Regular rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cts.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 307
Wanted: A New Word—ZONA GALE..... 309
Can We Test for Ethical Superiority? V.—CLARENCE R. SKINNER..... 310
Jottings—J. H. H..... 312

ARTICLES—

The Way of Peace—*M. K. Gandhi*..... 307
The Story of My Experiments with Truth—Chapter XIV—My Choice—*M. K. Gandhi*.. 312
Jails or "Hospitals"?—*M. K. Gandhi*..... 313
Training for Crime—LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.. 314

THE STUDY TABLE—

War Guilt Again!—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES... 317

CORRESPONDENCE—

President Coolidge and the League of Nations—EDWIN D. MEAD..... 318

THE FIELD—

Peace Resolutions 319
American Committee for Relief of Russian Children 319

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCIX MONDAY, JULY 12, 1926 NUMBER 20

THE WAY OF PEACE

The way of peace is the way of truth. Truthfulness is even more important than peacefulness. Indeed, lying is the mother of violence. A truthful man cannot long remain violent. He will perceive in the course of his search that he has no need to be violent and he will further discover that so long as there is the slightest trace of violence in him, he will fail to find the truth he is searching.

There is no half way between truth and non-violence on the one hand and untruth and violence on the other. We may never be strong enough to be entirely non-violent in thought, word and deed. But we must keep non-violence as our goal and make steady progress toward it. The attainment of freedom, whether for a man, a nation or the world, must be in exact proportion to the attainment of non-violence by each. Let those, therefore, who believe in non-violence as the only method of achieving real freedom, keep the lamp of non-violence burning bright in the midst of the present impenetrable gloom. The truth of a few will count, the untruth of millions will vanish even like chaff before a whiff of wind.

M. K. Gandhi.

Another remarkable endorsement has been given to the Outlawry of War as the central principle of an effective program for peace. This has been the contention of UNITY, as our readers can testify, ever since Mr. S. O. Levinson conceived this great idea of Outlawry and first gave it to the world through the columns of this journal. Now comes a two-days' meeting of some fifty or sixty distinguished churchmen representative of various opinions and points of view, called together by the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches to formulate a peace program which shall command the united allegiance of the churches of the nation, which proclaims as the first of a series of eight resolutions—

> We believe that war should no longer be used for the settlement of controversies between nations. Without questioning the right of self-defense as inherent and inalienable for all individuals and nations, we believe that a combined and frontal attack for the overthrow of the war system, which is force and violence, by making war a crime under the law of nations, should be the unifying purpose and dominating motive of all peace groups. We recognize the need of embodying this outlawry of war in a progressive codification of international law.

Here, not only in general, but in every particular detail, is UNITY'S program for the Outlawry of War, not by accident but by design, as we are definitely informed, this resolution was made the "keynote" resolution of the whole program as adopted. The churchmen, in other words, who were engaged in this business of organizing a campaign for peace in which all might engage, had come at last to the point of seeing that Outlawry was not only the policy upon which they could unite but also the policy which could alone make any campaign effective. It is this which makes the church movement for peace what it has never been before—a direct, uncompromising, frontal attack upon the institution of war as such! With war banished as a crime under the law of nations—delegalized as an accepted method of settling disputes—everything else in the peace program becomes possible. With war recognized and established, however, in even the smallest degree, as the last court of appeal in international controversies—the dread arbitrament of arms—world courts, leagues of nations, disarmament, and the rest, remain the vain and futile things that they have always been. Peace means getting rid of war; and getting rid of war means outlawing it along with piracy, the duel, and the saloon. We congratulate these churchmen on having seen the truth so clearly and proclaimed it so boldly.

Immediately following this resolution for the Outlawry of War, come resolutions endorsing "the ultimate membership of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice," and declaring that "some form of world organization is necessary as a pacific substitute for the war system. We recognize the League of Nations as the only such organization." These resolutions, which we shall print with the rest of the program in full in our department, "The Field," give us an admirable opportunity to restate, for the benefit particularly of our newer readers, our attitude toward the World Court and the League. We have been, and still are, opposed to both of these organizations, especially to American participation in their work, under the existing war system of international society. We say "war system" advisedly! War today is an established institution—legalized by international law, sanctified by custom and tradition and abundant patriotic teaching, supported and deliberately prepared for by the domestic policy of states. When every other method of settling a dispute between nations has failed, the institution of war is provided by law and sustained by public opinion as the court of last resort. With the practice of war thus built into the very fabric of our existing society, world courts and leagues of nations

are useless, or worse than useless. The Permanent Court of International Justice, like the Hague Court, is utterly powerless in any controversy between nations serious enough to threaten war. It can consider no case not submitted to it by consent or act of the disputants; if a case is submitted, its decision need not be accepted, or even heeded; if accepted, such decision becomes no part of international law, and thus has no power or influence as an established precedent. We are opposed to a court thus trying to temper a war system which by its very nature is exclusive of the judicial process. Such a court is a joke, where it is not an out-and-out tragedy. With the League of Nations, the situation is worse. For the League, unlike the World Court, is part and parcel of this very war system of which we speak. It is not an agent of peace at all, but, as events since Locarno abundantly testify, only the latest device for enabling the imperialistic powers of Europe to manipulate the existing situation to the advantage of any military alliance which chances at the moment to be on top. We are therefore opposed to the League!

The problem both of Court and League, however, becomes utterly transformed by the magic of Outlawry. Outlaw war as a crime, recodify international law in terms of this new definition of the war process, and the whole situation is changed. A world court now becomes necessary as a substitute for war as the tribunal of final arbitrament in the settlement of disputes between sovereign states. The Outlawry of War program has thus from the beginning included provision for an international court as the crown and glory of the whole reform. And such a court would be for the first time effective, for it would be given original and absolute jurisdiction—i. e., all cases would go automatically to its bar for settlement—and its decisions, as binding upon the world, would have power as themselves a part of the growing body of international law. So also with the League! The Outlawry of War program includes provision for an international assembly, or league. But such a league, under the Outlawry system, would be a true agency for peace. The present League is, by the very terms of its Covenant, a war-making body; and of course it has to be such, for it is an integral part, as we have explained above, of the existing war system of international society. But a league, operating under a code of international law banishing war as a crime, as the present code recognizes it as an institution, would by its very nature become a peace agency. It would be a part of a peace system, in other words, as the present League is part of a war system, and thus at last a beneficently effective organization. The present Court and League are frequently compared to our American governmental bodies, especially the World Court to our Supreme Court, and support for them besought on this ground. But is it not as plain as the nose on your face that there is a fundamental difference here involved? In America, as a union of sovereign states, war is outlawed—nay, it is not even mentioned. Under such a peace system, our Supreme Court is of course as benign as it is effective. Establish a similar peace system in the world at large, and Court and League will be similarly sound. Our churchmen, therefore, did right in endorsing Court and League *after* endorsing the Outlawry of War.

Reports from India, derived from personal sources, indicate that Gandhi's great effort for the unification of all political parties in India under the compromise agreement of the so-called Sabaramati Pact (see UNITY, May 31, page 211), has been temporarily checked. Leaders of liberal groups opposed to direct attack upon the English *Raj,* stuck to their resolution not to join the National Congress, as proposed, unless the plank of mass civil disobedience as laid down by the Mahatma were withdrawn from the platform of the Congress. This principle of civil disobedience, including non-payment of taxes, is, of course, the politics of Gandhi's movement, as non-violence is the ethics of this movement. To sacrifice this principle would be to sacrifice everything—but his opponents would not have it so! What Gandhi and Mrs. Naidu and their associates are facing here is obviously a body of sentiment which, after all, is favorable to British rule, and at bottom desires no separation from the crown. But deeper than this is a discipline, a consecration, a sacrifice exacted by Gandhi's movement which these liberals and others are not able or ready to assume. In this sense is Gandhi's program a test as to whether the Indians themselves are fit for freedom. That freedom, as the Mahatma sees with divine clearness, comes from within and expresses itself in acts of service, love and fellowship which purify the heart. Hence his emphasis upon the spinning wheel, upon Hindu-Moslem unity, upon the redemption of the untouchables, as the unescapable preparations for that achievement of national independence of which civil disobedience is the program or method. That discipline of this kind cannot be attained all at once, or soon, Gandhi knows; therefore is he very patient, while still working unremittingly to organize his movement to victory. Already it is proposed that a special session of the Congress be called this August to undertake directly the task of uniting all parties in the common work for the nation's liberation.

The story of the Pennsylvania primaries has been told—or told at least as much as ever it will be known. That there are depths of corruption and dishonor underneath these foul depths now uncovered is as certain as anything can be in this uncertain world, but they will never be revealed. Now that Senator Reed and his colleagues have completed their investigation, so ably

and fearlessly carried through, what is going to be done about it? So far as we can see, the American people are stirred by these Pennsylvania disclosures just about as much as they were by the Teapot Dome scandal—which, being interpreted, means, not at all! Secretary Mellon, source of supply for the ballot-mongers, still sits in the cabinet of the President. Senator Pepper, intended beneficiary of a campaign fund now known to total well up to two million dollars, still occupies his seat in the Senate, and, so far as we know, is as potent a lay-leader in the Episcopal church as ever. Representative Vare, second to Pepper in campaign financing if first at the ballot box, still goes in and out of the House and casts his vote on legislation. The hearings in Washington, while well reported and uncovering the most dreadful tale of political debauchery since the days of its famous and infamous "blocks of five," had hard work holding the front page in competition with the Eucharistic Congress and the Swedish Prince. The people are simply not interested—a fact which reveals anew the most sinister situation in the United States today. The American conscience, if not actually dead, is more effectually asleep than at any other period of history of which we have memory. Fat with prosperity, hungry for pleasure and dissipation, our citizens are apparently ready to stand for anything so long as it doesn't increase taxes or raise the price of automobiles. That we have lost our spirit of idealism altogether, that we are no longer able to distinguish between right and wrong, is incredible. But that, temporarily at least, we are drugged to utter moral insensibility, seems to be true, too true.

Wanted: A New Word

The English language is in need of enrichment by the addition of a word to substitute for our clumsy and inaccurate word "non-resistance." The negative words—the nons and the antis—often seem to be obliged to bear the beautiful burden of our idealisms, but they all bear it badly. "Anti-saloon." What an expression. "Non-cooperation"—not much better. "Anti-narcotic"—it is not enough. "Non-resistance"—nothing could be more spineless. There was one time however, when, as I think, the anti's had all the brunt and the humor of the negative word. For the suffragists had the flaming positive. Perhaps that is why they won.

A flaming positive is in the connotation of non-resistance. But none of this appears on either side of the hyphen when the two sides appear together. Nobody wants to follow a "non." And "resistance" has gathered unto itself all the pride and the pictures of five thousand years. Resistance. Everybody loves to resist. Arnold van Winkelreid, bowing among them like a tree, stirs everybody in a fashion which the mere word liberty cannot accomplish alone. The race has never yet grown up, as a race, to thrill in the same fashion to "he opened not his mouth."

In the making of this new word, then, our task is clear. There must be no mere non, no mere anti, but a transvaluation of all the living positives which kindle in that word resistance. This will mean the assuming of no mask. It will mean, rather, digging deeper into the concept of non-resistance itself.

What is this non-resistance?

The Bible gives the words of Jesus:

> Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you that ye resist not one who doeth thee evil.

It is these words which have painted the physical picture of the one who bears no resentment *and does nothing.* The word non-resistance literally applies to only this much of that fertile passage in the Sermon on the Mount. But Jesus did not stop there. He gave his non-resistant something to do:

> . . . but whoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man shall sue thee at the law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away.

Here is no pacifist. Here is Christ proposing a program. Namely, having the self-control not to resent an injury, then going on with the next step and performing a positive good. One must, if one is consistent. For not resenting an injury, as Christ meant this, certainly did not mean mere self-control, mere silence with the resentment really received in the heart. No, it meant of course not experiencing resentment in the heart. Showing self-control when one "doeth thee evil" is merely good manners; mere good breeding dictates that resentment is ridiculous. Jesus meant more than this. He meant that there should be no inner flash of resentment either. He meant that that inner flash must have been habitually overcome by something. By what? Of course by that which he called love, which is the last step in the simple knowledge that "he hath made one" all the peoples of the earth. That "brotherhood is a fact in nature." That we are essentially one essence. That when our essence errs we feel not resentment but compassion, patience; and a desire to heal that error. We can work at this healing, whether it be in ourselves or in another. The same touch heals both. Do something! Do a favor to an enemy, and the enemy is gone. . . .

But one says: "You do not know human nature. Do a favor to an enemy and he is nettled, vexed to be

set at a disadvantage, annoyed to have you appear superior."

Did Jesus not know human nature? And interpreting it, did he always give a physical example and leave us with no more than that?

The left cheek, the cloak, the two miles, the giving and the lending are literally to be acted out, but these are only the body of this program which he proposes; while, as always, the spirit is the real factor. The cheek, the cloak, the miles, the gift, the loan—these are nothing without the release of an inner energy which goes forth and touches the one who does the injury or who makes the demand. An inner energy which claims him; which, in language for the Holy Spirit, devours him.

This is a high practice, a daily magic of turning clay into gold. Yet it must be done not self-consciously, as by an alchemist, skilled in secret ways; must be done indeed not in individual strength at all, but by the energy which one has allowed to pour through one from another source.

The *energy*. Not the passivity. Not the mere non-resistance. It is this strange and negative interpretation of such a program which has so vitiated the noble word pacifist. Or perhaps it is that we, as pacifists, have not yet learned to use this energy, to bring it through, to make it felt. It is this same negative interpretation which has been falsely used to preach to the exploited and the oppressed a "Christian resignation." The alternative is not physical force on the one hand or passivity on the other; it is not any form whatever of violence and physical resistance on the one hand, or resignation on the other. The choice is rather between physical resistance and spiritual energy.

Non-resistance? One might as well give that name to the touch upon the electric button which starts into action any titanic dynamo. And that dynamo is to hand-power what the active positive applied force of love is to man's puny powers of resistance.

Wanted: A new word!

ZONA GALE.

Can We Test for Ethical Superiority?

V

Another test which seems to be amply borne out by experience, and which has been proposed under one form or another by most of the great ethical teachers, is socialization. The good man is one who realizes the fact of his relationship to other members of society. He is aware that his life is not an isolated atom, that he is not an independent unit free to live as he may desire, but that his whole being is not only a part of, but in large proportion a product of humanity.

Prof. Cooley in his great works, "Human Nature and the Social Order" and "Social Organization," has clearly demonstrated that there is no opposition between the social and individual aspects of a person. They are both necessary and complementary phases of one thing, and that thing is "human life." The fact which separates man most completely from the animals is his need of interstimulation and response. A chicken if isolated from the group begins immediately to live as a chicken. Its characteristics are largely innate and fixed. This is largely true of cats and dogs, and even of monkeys. But a human being, separated from his kind at birth and reared in isolation, is something less than human. He is more than the ape, but he is a man only in the biological sense of having arms and legs, nerves and brains like men. He is not human in the full sense of that term which means language, invention, culture, art, philosophy, religion.

It is for this reason that Cooley declares that human nature is not the possession of an individual as such, but is rather the product of group life. Strip us today of all that has gone into the making of society and we become stripped of our humanity. Suddenly plunge any of us into the conditions of savagery, and then remove us from all interstimulation with other humans, and we would probably become either insane or dead.

This is but an inadequate way of bringing home to our realization the fact of our interrelation with and interdependence upon society.

It follows from the above premises that our ethical life partakes of the social life, and if we owe our present humanity to the development of culture, then the ethically superior person is one who lives most worthily as a member of society, realizing his debt to others.

Again to quote Dewey: "There is a peculiar inconsistency in the current idea that morals *ought* to be social. The introduction of the moral 'ought' into the idea contains an implicit assertion that morals depend upon something apart from social relations. Morals *are* social."

The truth of Dewey's assertion is realized when we see that it is almost impossible to conceive a virtue which does not owe its existence in some measure to social relationships. A man reared in isolation would have few ethical motives, partly because he would not have the incentive of praise and blame, but more especially because he would lack the interstimulation and response which calls out the ethical type of behavior.

A brief enumeration of some of the virtues will illustrate this point clearly.

Truthfulness depends upon some one to whom we must be true. Truth is one of the foundations of the stability of all social relations. Without it there can be no secure education, economic relations, international exchange. Without it friendship crumbles, recreation degenerates, all life is thrown into chaos. The ethically superior man therefore recognizes that he must be truthful, because all social stability depends upon it; because when he is true he is making his contribution to the upbuilding of society, and when he is untrue, he is contributing to the breakdown of all that we hold to be essential for the progress and stability of humanity.

Justice depends upon the give and take of social relationships, or as Theodore Parker put it, "Justice is the common human bond." No man can be just alone, but rather the virtue belongs to a situation in which men have become keenly sensitive to their interdependence one with another. The gradual evolution of our present standards of justice has been a process covering centuries of time and immeasurable struggles. Remove justice from our present world and the pillars of civilization would come crashing down about us—we would swiftly return to slavery, cruelty, worse poverty, ignorance, and disease. The ethically superior man is the just man because he realizes that every one of his acts affects others, and therefore he must so live that what he does and even what he thinks will have an ennobling effect upon his fellowmen and upon civilization.

So with bravery or courage. It takes its rise largely in our thought of what is expected of us by others. We do the hard and courageous thing because we do not want to be known as cowards, and we are cowards, physical or moral, when we do not play our part as we should play it. The social nature of courage was well brought out in the great war when it was said that every soldier had two fears—one, of the enemy, and the other of being known by his fellows as being afraid, and of the two fears the first was the lesser.

The virtues of sympathy, generosity, kindliness, helpfulness, etc., are so clearly of social origin and nature that they need no exposition.

The more carefully one thinks of the relation of the individual to society, the more one sees that in that relation is the guarantee of the ethical life. It not only causes the virtue to spring into being, but sustains it and strengthens it, and the measure of a man's ethical superiority becomes increasingly the extent to which the man is socialized. Prof. Mary W. Calkins in her excellent volume, "The Good Man and the Good," says in substantiation of this view: "It is certainly true that a crass individualist would wisely cultivate thrift and abstinence, courage and prudence, in order to further his own ends, yet for the moral self who has discovered that the good must be defined in social terms 'there are,' as Clifford says, 'no self-regarding virtues properly so-called.' Such a man will study to be brave and prudent, thrifty and abstinent; but his virtuous purpose will have regard to other selves and he will act for himself only as he is vitally a part of the Great Community to which he is loyal."

This thought has been expressed by three great ethical teachers in slightly different ways. First there is the law of Confucius: "What you would not like to have done to yourself, do it not unto others." This recognizes the fact that every individual's conduct must be tested by its effect upon others. We must not do or think anything which will injure the personality of another. The ethically superior person pauses before he acts and asks himself, "How will this affect others? If I am dishonest, cruel, untruthful, sensuous and complaining, what kind of life will others about me have to lead?" Count Keyserling suggests that the Confucian emphasis upon the negative aspect of this law is wiser than the Christians' positive emphasis in that it allows greater freedom and respect to the individual. We should not try to superimpose our standards and dislikes upon anyone, but merely be sure that we avoid doing them harm. The Chinese ideal is non-interference, the non-injury of others.

On the other hand, the statement of the Golden Rule by Jesus recognizes a positive responsibility to act. "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." This is a recognition of the solidarity of humanity and the inescapable interrelationship of moral acts. The ethically superior person according to Jesus is one who tests his own life by this measure: "Have I done what makes others happy, free, good? Does my life add to the richness and fullness of others?" While there are dangers of intolerance in our views of doing good, as the Confucianist sees, the principle of the ethical life as a positive, constructive force is sound, if it is guided by a broad, sympathy.

And lastly Kant in his "categorical imperative" gave us a similar test for the good life. So live that thy act may become universal. There are few if any tests which show more clearly the kind of life we live, and which reveal more fully its ethical content. Imagine any thought, impulse or deed with this command in mind, and instantly we see its moral value. What kind of world would this be like, if everyone in it were doing what we have done or plan to do. This reveals our ethical solidarity with the whole race. It indicates that the superior man is one who lives so that his life may become a model for the world.

(To be concluded.)

CLARENCE R. SKINNER.

Jottings

The four articles on the English strike—two written by Mrs. Emily Lovett Eaton and one each by Walter Walsh and Angelo Morgan—published in our issues of June 7th, 14th and 21st, furnished the most complete and vivid report of that great event that appeared in any American weekly, religious or otherwise. This is an example of the kind of service which we are striving to furnish our readers. Our thanks are due and herewith offered to our correspondents.

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle tells us that his "spirit warnings" of a coming catastrophe are persistent. This may be impressive, but why go to heaven for such warnings when Europe is full of them?

Mussolini has written a "Credo" for all good Italians. A frank paraphrase, if not parody, of the Apostles' Creed, it runs in part as follows:

"I believe in the genius of Mussolini;

"In our Holy Father, Fascism and in the communion of its martyrs;

"In the conversion of Italians;

"In the resurrection of the Empire."

Devout Christians must enjoy this kind of thing!

In the same Senate chamber in which he was vilified, and from which he was all but expelled as a traitor, Robert M. LaFollette was recently eulogized as one of the greatest of Americans. Not in years has Washington seen such a meeting in memory of a deceased statesman. Thus again do we rear splendid tombs to the prophets whom we have stoned—and learn nothing! For if another LaFollette should come, we would stone him in the same old way.

Graham Wallas reminds us of the curious fact that "we can make war efficiently, but cannot prevent war." Our minds are capable of controlling and directing the forces involved in the one phenomenon but not in the other. This is only one illustration, says Wallas, of the sharp limits thus far set in our practical capacity. Hence his plea for "an art of thought" that will control every system of life!

The United States increased its military expenditures, in the period from 1914 to 1924, from something over $257,000,000 to approximately $618,000,000. This is an increase in a decade of 140 per cent, or, from the standpoint of the lessened value of the dollar, of 53 per cent. Do we wonder that foreign observers are speaking of this country as "belligerent Uncle Sam"?

J. H. H.

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

[The Autobiography of Mahatma Gandhi]

(Copyrighted, 1926)

CHAPTER XIV

My Choice

Dr. Mehta went on Monday to the Victoria Hotel expecting to find me there. He discovered that we had left, got our new address, and met me at our rooms. Through sheer folly I had managed to get ringworm on the boat. For washing and bathing we used to have sea-water, in which soap is not soluble. I however employed soap, taking its use to be a sign of civilization with the result that instead of cleaning it made the skin greasy. This gave me ringworm. I showed it to Dr. Mehta, who told me to apply acetic acid. I remember how the burning acid made my cry. Dr. Mehta inspected my room and its appointments and shook his head in disapproval. "This place won't do," he said. "We come to England not so much for the purpose of studies as for gaining experience of English life and customs. And for this you need to live with a family. But before you do so, I think you had better serve a period of apprenticeship. I shall take you there."

I gratefully accepted the suggestion and removed to the friend's rooms. He was all kindness and attention. He treated me as his own brother, initiated me into English ways and manners, and accustomed me to talking the language. My food, however, became a serious question. I could not relish boiled vegetable without salt or condiments mixed at the time of preparation. The landlady was at a loss to know what to cook for me. We had oatmeal porridge for breakfast which was fairly filling, but I always starved at lunch and dinner. The friend continually reasoned with me to eat meat, but I always pleaded my vow and then remained silent. Both for luncheon and dinner we had bread and jam and spinach. I was a good eater and had a capacious stomach; but I was ashamed to ask for more than two or three slices of bread, as it did not seem correct to do so. Added to this there was no milk either for lunch or dinner. The friend once got disgusted with this state of things and said: "Had you been my own brother, I would have sent you packing. What is the value of a vow made before an illiterate mother, and in ignorance of conditions here. It is no vow at all. It would not be regarded as a vow in law. It is a pure superstition to stick to such a promise. And I tell you this persistence will not help you to gain anything here. You confess to having eaten and relished meat. You took it where it was absolutely unnecessary, and will not where it is quite essential. What a pity!"

But I was adamant.

Day in and day out the friend would argue, but I had an eternal negative to face him with. The more he argued, the more uncompromising I became. Daily I would pray for God's protection and get it. Not that I had any idea of God. It was faith that was at work —faith of which the seed was sown by the good nurse Rambha.

One day the friend began to read to me Bentham's "Theory of Utility." I was at my wit's end. The language was too difficult for me to understand. He began to expound it. I said: "Pray forgive me. These abstruse things are beyond me. I admit it is necessary to eat meat. But I cannot break my vow. I cannot argue about it. I am sure I cannot meet you in argument. But please give me up as foolish or obstinate. I appreciate your love for me and I know you to be my well-wisher. I also know that you are telling me again and again about this because you feel for me. But I am helpless. A vow is a vow. It cannot be broken."

The friend looked at me in surprise. He closed the book and said: "All right. I shall not argue any more." I was glad. He never discussed the subject again. But he did not cease to worry about me. He smoked and drank, but he never asked me to do so. In fact he asked me to remain away from both. His one anxiety was lest I might become very weak without meat, and thereby be unable to feel at home in England.

That is how I served my apprenticeship for a month. The friend's house was in Richmond, and it was not possible to go to London more than once or twice a week. Dr. Mehta and Mr. Dalpatram Shukla therefore decided that I should be put with some family. Mr. Shukla hit upon an Anglo-Indian's house in West Kensington and placed me there. The landlady was a widow. I told her about my vow. The old lady promised to look after me properly, and I took up my residence in her house. Here too I practically had to starve. I had sent for sweets and other eatables from home, but nothing had yet come. Everything was insipid. Everyday the old lady asked me whether I liked the food, but what could she do? I was still as shy as ever and dared not ask for more than was put before me. She had two daughters. They insisted on serving me with an extra slice or two. But little did they know that nothing less than a loaf would have filled me.

But I had found my wings now. I had not yet started upon my regular studies. I had just begun reading newspapers, thanks to Mr. Shukla. In India I had never read a newspaper. But here I succeeded in cultivating a liking for them by regular reading. I always glanced over the *Daily News, Daily Telegraph,* and *Pall Mall Gazette.* This took me hardly an hour. I therefore began to wander about. I would launch out in search of a vegetarian restaurant. The landlady had told me that there were such places in the city. I would trot ten to twelve miles each day, go into a cheap restaurant and eat my fill of bread, but would never be satisfied. During these wanderings I once hit on a vegetarian restaurant in Farringdon Street. The sight of it filled me with the same joy that a child feels on getting a thing after its own heart. Before I entered I noticed books for sale exhibited under a glass window near the door. I saw among them Salt's "Plea for Vegetarianism." This I purchased for a shilling and went straight to the dining room. This was my first hearty meal since my arrival in England. God had come to my aid.

I read Salt's book from cover to cover and was very much impressed by it. From the date of reading this book I may claim to have become a vegetarian by choice. I blessed the day on which I had taken the vow before my mother. I had all along abstained from meat in the interests of truth and of the vow I had taken, but had wished at the same time that every Indian should be a meat-eater, and had looked forward to being one myself freely and openly some day, and to enlisting others in the cause. The choice was now made in favor of vegetarianism, the spread of which henceforward became my mission.

(Translated from Navajivan by Mahadeo Desai.)

M. K. GANDHI.

Jails or "Hospitals"?

Lord Lytton, in recently speaking about jails to the Rotarians of Calcutta, said that just as we send our sick in body to hospitals and not to jails, so must we "provide moral doctors and moral hospitals" for the sick in mind, i. e., criminals. His Excellency thus introduced his subject:

> The ideal I wish to set before you, stated in the briefest and simplest form, is just this—the substitution of reformation for retribution as the basis of our Penal Code. Punishment can instill fear and enforce habits—it cannot inspire goodness. As a means of moral regeneration, therefore, it is worse than useless and should be abandoned. A morality which is only enforced by pains and penalties is a false morality, and those who would secure the acceptance of moral standards should employ other methods.

Of the uses and limitations of punishments, Lord Lytton said:

> Punishment, if resorted to at all, must always be aimed at teaching habits necessary for the well-being of the individual or discipline necessary to the well-being of a community. I do not say that punishment will always succeed; the form of punishment selected in any particular case may be well or badly suited for the attainment of its object. Again, I do not say that punishment is the only way of achieving this object. What I say is that those are the only objects which can be obtained by punishment. The one thing which can never be acquired by coercion is goodness or moral conduct. All punishment, therefore, which aims at correcting wickedness or teaching goodness is definitely mischievous. Goodness is a condition of mind, as health is a condition of the body. Moral defects of character are no more to be cured by punishment than defects of the body. It may be necessary in the interest of health of a community forcibly to segregate a person with an infectious disease; it may be necessary on the same ground to segregate persons whose moral defects are a danger to society; but it would be just as senseless and mischievous to try to cure a man of scarlet fever by shutting him up with a number of persons suffering from measles, tuberculosis or leprosy, as it is to try to cure a man of stealing or cheating by shutting him up with other thieves and cheats.

After this pronouncement one would expect a description of prison reform being attempted or pending in Bengal. Instead, however, H. E. the Governor of Bengal quoted two instances of successful humanitarian effort in England, and said:

You may ask why I have chosen to speak to you about this subject. The reason is that this is work which no government can do. Governments only hamper and spoil work of this kind by interference; it must be done by those who have the calling.

Having thus absolved his and all governments from responsibility for the much needed reform, he threw it on the broad and "idealistic" shoulders of the Rotarians present.

As an old and experienced prisoner, however, I believe that governments have to begin the reform. Lord Lytton will have his hearers to reckon with. Humanitarians can but supplement government efforts. As it is, the humanitarian, if he attempts anything, will first have to undo the mischief done in prisons where environment hardens criminal tendency, and where innocent prisoners learn how to commit crimes without being detected. I hold that humanitarian effort cannot cope with the evil wrought in the jails. Lord Lytton must have recognized this patent fact when in his introduction he talked of substituting "reformation for retribution as the basis of our Penal Code." But, evidently, in winding up his speech he forgot that he had intended his Penal Code to be the basis of reform, and as he realized that he had no reform to show to the credit of his government, wound up by saying that it was no business of governments to attempt the reform.

If, as Lord Lytton correctly put it, punishment must be inflicted purely for protection of society, mere detention should be enough and that, too, only till the detenues can be fairly presumed to have been cured of their evil habits or securities are found for their good behavior. There can be no difficulty about a scientific classification of prisoners, apportionment of work from a humanitarian standpoint, selection of better-class warders, abolition of the system of appointing prisoners as warders, and a host of other changes that one might easily suggest.

According to Lord Lytton's own standard the detention of political prisoners without trial and their reported ill treatment is wholly wrong. It is to be wished that His Excellency will apply his own admirable tests to the administration of his own jails, and there is no doubt that he will make startling discoveries in the shape of reforms that can be easily attempted by his government, far more easily than anything that humanitarians can ever hope to attempt or achieve.

M. K. GANDHI.

Young India.

Training for Crime

To its remotest districts the country has been startled and shocked by the unusual prevalence of crime during the past few years. Its manifestations have been faithfully and often luridly represented by the daily press, and month after month has passed with apparently no cessation in criminal activities. Efforts to diminish it have served to concentrate public attention upon it even more closely, and this is desirable as it tends to make thoughtful persons reflect more and more deeply upon its reasons for being. But to obtain good and lasting results in the repression of crime is a matter of extraordinary difficulty. It will be as impossible to check crime to any appreciable degree without removing its roots and causes as it would be to stop an epidemic of typhoid while the community continues to gets its water supply from a polluted source.

Crime does not just happen. It is not a thing of the moment. Crime is a symptom—or definite result of existing conditions. Therefore it is ever present. There are many psychological factors that enter into its continuance which only psychologists can adequately discuss, since only trained minds can adequately discuss the deeper problems connected with their professions. Here is where physicians who specialize in mental conditions of all varieties can render valuable service. Are they already enlightening the public on these lines? An intelligent public opinion based on the latest scientific knowledge is the imperative need of the day if crime is to be successfully combatted and reduced to a negligible proportion—as can be done by united and sustained effort.

There is, however, one powerful factor in this crime problem that is easily recognizable and can be entirely eliminated if people are sufficiently aroused and informed and desirous of eliminating it. That factor is war. War is the sum total of evils. It includes all kinds and varieties of depravity. It is lawlessness let loose—like an immense tidal wave or terrific cyclone. It is the giant atrocity that breeds all other atrocities. Its influence is both contagious and infectious and the spirit it arouses spreads like a pestilence. Considering the evil passions engendered by it, what wonder that crime is rampant during a war and seems to gather impetus after its close?

War is legalized crime. How shall we abate and prevent crime when the greatest of all crimes is maintained as a lawful institution and its threat is held constantly before us by our army and navy chiefs who feel they neglect their duty if they do otherwise? No one can think of war, real war, without visualizing ground strewn with dead and dying men whose lives have been extinguished by violence. That death by violent means should be condoned, upheld as righteous, stamps impressions on the brain whose future effects are beyond computation. Take into consideration all the various factors making for crime that are exerting influence under existing conditions and should we be surprised at its present orgy?

Is it to be wondered at that the minds of the young are receptive to ideas of crime when, from their earliest childhood, they hear about war and their minds are filled with thoughts of death by violence—and with more and more suggestions of increasing these deaths by additional and more dreadful and destructive devices? Try to soften this as much as may be under the guise of patriotism or any other term, the ugly spectre of mass murder will not down and it will create its sinister mental effects. The subtle thought that in war murder is committed and property destroyed under government protection cannot fail to produce grave results. An army epitomizes power. It is an agent of terrorism. It seeks to achive results by trickery and force regardless of justice. What more natural than that people, and perhaps especially young people, should be imbued with its terroristic spirit and imitate its barbarous methods?

An ancient proverb reads: "Train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it." This holds equally true of training in the way he should not go. A child's mind is a sensitized plate ready for diversified impressions that will be lasting, since the plate is a living one whose pictures cannot be removed by chemicals. Up to the age of at least five or six years the impressions made upon a child's mind should relate chiefly to happiness and health, the cultivation of the higher emotions and characteristics and obedience to reasonable demands. There will be plenty of time later for gaining knowledge of the sorrows and tragedies of life. The results of nursery training with pistols and guns and soldiers, and games wherein the fighting and killing of enemies are a feature, are all assets for the militarists. The early prints made upon the clean, impressionable minds of childhood are deepened by effects of pictures of relatives or family friends in uniform and stories of their deeds of valor and those of celebrated commanders and officers in army and navy. These are followed by military drill in high school and college which makes the early impressions well-nigh indelible, and the models evolved are the joy of all who still believe in the need of collective homicide, and at the same time they are likely aspirants for prison terms. What wonder that jails and prisons are crowded with criminals of all shades and grades of depravity?

By those who do not agree that there is any special relation between war and crime, the argument is advanced that from 1865 to 1917 this country "was not engaged in any war that amounted to much but that there was a great deal of crime." That is all true. But an important point to be kept in mind is that the resultant conditions of a mental impression may not necessarily be immediate.

There was a great increase of crime in the years immediately following our Civil War over previous years and this was undoubtedly a direct effect of the war. Also, for years afterward the war was an almost daily topic of conversation. This or that happened before the war, or during the war or since the war. Anecdotes were related to which children eagerly listened. Boys and young men were given military drill in high school and college. The thought of war was constantly to the front, with its baleful suggestions of death by violence. Pictures called cycloramas were exhibited showing gruesome details of the battle of Gettysburg and other memorable conflicts. Published stories, both true and false, realistic, dramatic, sensational, abounded. The high cost of living was another wholesale effect. The atmosphere was charged and surcharged, day in and day out, with ideas about all sorts of things and circumstances that related directly to the war as their reason for being. G. A. R. posts flourished in the North, exerting unceasing influence, while throughout the South poverty and hardship were widespread and bitterness and hatred toward the victorious "Yanks" smouldered or flamed as the case might be. So the war spirit was kept alive and its malevolent effects were continually shown in the unprecedented number of deeds of violence and dishonesty.

Late in the century came the Spanish War and the country lost its head, as every country always does when a war is on, and the war spirit sprang into strong revival. With revival of this spirit came a revival of crime. Though wars have not been numerous that the United States has engaged in, they have been frequent enough to exert an influence that has not died out before the next was on the docket. And the thought of possible war and of dreadful conflicts that other great nations were waging has been an overhanging cloud of sinister horror under which the whole world has existed and which has infected all minds with its pernicious potency. War creates an oppression as from a sense of guilt which affects all minds, and those of young people are especially receptive to its influence. Think of the world, this whole great world, living day after day, week after week, month after month, year in and year out, dominated by the thought of the necessity of continual preparation so that nations may engage in slaughtering each other!

Nothing that has been written here should be interpreted as implying that every man in the service is a potential criminal. Far from it. There are many whose mental and moral qualities are sufficiently strong to withstand the evil influences which surround them. But these influences work havoc by lowering the morale of a larger number in the ranks than it is possible to estimate and spread abroad their miasmata far beyond the confines of the actual armed forces. Ponsonby tells us: "War, for years after, increases crimes, which, as the official blue-book states, may be assignable 'to the long-continued debasing effects of the war upon conduct and character.'"

By the elimination of war criminality would lose one of its chief breeding places. And the outlawry or absolute elimination of war is a simple matter in comparison to the suppression or elimination of crime, since all that is needed to outlaw war is a sufficiently strong will to peace. The matter is eminently psychological. War has been, and still is, regarded by most as a necessary evil simply because people have been so taught. As soon as it is generally understood that war is never necessary and that peace can always be maintained whenever peace is preferred to war, the establishment of permanent peace can quickly be brought about. It cannot be too emphatically stated that the preservation of peace depends upon whether the desire for peace is stronger than the desire for war. As some writer has said:

> If all the people who are going up and down the world declaring that there will always be wars and that we must get ready for the next war would maintain that another war was unthinkable and impossible, we should soon be headed up the road toward universal peace.

There are no international difficulties or complications that need inevitably to lead to war. Boundary lines between countries are a fruitful source of conflict, but the boundary between Canada and the United States was settled satisfactorily by peaceful means though there had been much fervid expression by those belligerently inclined. But recognition of the fact that warfare would entail greater loss than any possible gain led to the triumph of sane deliberations over insane violence. Whatever the controversial matter may be peaceful and reasonable methods can always be employed when the maintenance of peace is preferred. According to Arthur Ponsonby in "Now Is the Time," there have been international difficulties since the close of the World War that might easily have been made the basis for war had not the countries at odds been in too exhausted a condition to fight. He says: "A few years after a war, causes which otherwise would certainly lead to war pass because the governments are well

aware they cannot depend on their peoples to fight. There have been far graver points of difference between nations in the seven years since 1918, because of the policy of the statesmen who made peace, than ever there were in the seven years before 1914. . . . If causes of war were genuine—and I have most emphatically pointed out that they never are—they might occur at any time, sometimes in rapid succession. The fact that we find the greater European wars spaced out at decent intervals is very significant; it means that the governments have to wait till they feel sure the people are ready, and, however great the provocation may be in between whiles, they will adjust their diplomacy so as to compromise over a settlement. The phrases 'the country is exhausted,' 'there is war weariness,' mean, in plain English, the people won't fight. Quarrels consequently are adjusted without any loss of prestige or self-respect, and the absence of any power to threaten force no doubt helps a settlement. Whereas, if twenty or thirty years have passed without war, the government feels it can safely adopt a more truculent attitude; it can be uncompromising and use just the threats it dared not use before; its plans and tricks to cajole the people may be depended upon to operate successfully, and the so-called cause of war will soon arise. As long as there is reason to believe that there is any widespread reluctance on the part of the people, no *casus belli* will appear on the horizon."

Almost as familiar as the ancient proverb previously quoted is a statement said to have been made by a noted church dignitary to the effect that, given the education of a child for the first seven years, he would answer for the child's religious belief through life. Better evidence could hardly be found of the importance which may be placed upon early mental training with assurance of its desired outcome. In endeavoring to determine the whys and wherefores of moral qualities, doubtless inherited tendencies count somewhat, and there is probably a profound truth in the witticism of Oliver Wendell Holmes that to make a gentleman of any man it is necessary to begin with his grandparents. But heredity in actual morality or immorality plays a part so slight as to be scarcely noticeable in proportion to the influence exerted by direct environment and education. "There are no bad children," said a distinguished judge of a Juvenile Court. "It is the fool fathers and the silly mothers who are to blame."

Of all the important contributions that scientific study and research have given the world during the past fifty years there is nothing of greater value and significance, or that is destined to have more definite bearing on the well-being of the race, than the work that has been done in psychology relating to the subconscious mind. Before those most familiar with facts and laws of this subject, doctors of medicine and of psychology, lies the plain duty of enlightening the public about the pressing needs in the education of children and youth, especially since the close relation of the subconscious mind to both mental and physical health is being more and more understood.

As previously suggested, the subject of crime can be dealt with thoroughly and satisfactorily only by experts. It seems strange that the truth of the old adage should have been so widely accepted as axiomatic and yet that its teaching should have been applied so little in the treatment and understanding of criminals. That restraint of criminals is essential no reasonable person would attempt to deny. The well-being of society demands drastic measures for its full protection. And during the term of restraint the psychology of each one should be studied and the case dealt with according to individual needs if repetition of any particular offense is to be prevented. But it must be understood that back of all the immediate manifestation of criminal propensity the early training is what has formed the tendencies of mind.

Children are natural imitators. Habits formed in tender years persist. The examples set by parents and other adults are followed. And children are quick to see beneath the surface and sense reality in spite of protestation or admonition. The suggestions imprinted on the mind during childhood are unerringly indicated in later years. Even the bestowal of severe physical punishment may have deleterious results. A blow, a stroke, generally creates in the recipient angry and outraged feelings and an immediate desire for retaliation or revenge; and such a state of mind leaves no chance for any beneficial results desired as the effect of deserved punishment at the time and may be the source of future trouble. Mental complexes are delicate things to tamper with in any period of life, but especially so during years of youth. Ruin may follow the touch of the ignorant or unskilled. The defiant spirit so frequently aroused by harsh treatment and a sad or sullen brooding over the wrong of extreme severity are perhaps equally fraught with danger for the days to come. Either may lead to morbidity and land its desperate possessor in evil ways from a flood tide of emotion.

That conditions are not worse than they are and that human nature shows up as favorably as it does when all the drawbacks to noble development are considered are really the things to be wondered at. The logical inference is that our human nature—far from being the poor and depraved thing that militarists would have us believe craves an outlet by being encouraged to commit murder under legal protection—has tendencies toward the good that are constantly overcoming the evil influences at work in many ways and gives continual evidence of divine origin. When the proper training of child nature is understood, and we live in accordance with psychological law, crime will be reduced to an astonishingly small amount. This talk of stamping out crime by forcible methods is *prima facie* evidence of ignorance of psychological law. It simply can't be done. The repression of crime will be a long and arduous process requiring intelligence and skill of the highest order. When we work in harmony with nature's laws, in short, cooperate with nature, we shall be able to conquer crime. No feeble half-way measures will avail. Nothing less than methods founded on the eternal rock of science will suffice. But those will transform chaos into order in the mental and moral as well as in the physical world.

Would it be demanding too much of legislators, and others holding prominent and authoritative positions, if we expect them to recognize the underlying truth that the human mind is governed by the same laws among all classes of people and all races and will react to the same impulses? General mental characteristics do not vary in rich or poor, high or low. Those who seek to control others by unscientific methods may as well quit their job. No lasting good can be achieved by superficial means. And everyone may well keep in mind one fundamental law, applicable to all normal individuals: Violence provokes violence; love inspires love.

LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.

The Study Table

War Guilt Again!

That Germany was guilty of the Great War is a myth now so effectually exploded that it would seem as though the discussion might be regarded as closed, at least for intelligent people. The myth, however, was so widely scattered and deeply rooted by Allied propaganda during and after the conflict, and it still flourishes so abundantly in the minds of the general public, the newspaper editors, and the historians with whom pride and prejudice are more important than truth, that it is just as well to have the discussion go on. The verdict is in, but most people don't know it; so the oftener the case is resurveyed, and the real story retold, the better.

It is from this point of view that we welcome four remarkable books* just recently published. One is by an Englishman, another by a German, the third by a Frenchman, and the last by an American. Here are varied sources of information, and of course, in detail at least, somewhat different viewpoints. But in the main issue—in their answers to the one basic question of responsibility for the Great War of 1914-1918—all these four books are agreed. They say what E. D. Morel and Bertrand Russell and George Demartial said during the War, what Francis Neilson and Albert J. Nock boldly asserted just after the War, what Sidney Fay suggested first and John S. Ewart proved first among historians—that responsibility for the War was at best a distributed responsibility as between Russia, France, Austria, Germany and England in about the order named, and at worst a responsibility shared almost exclusively by Russia and France. It is conspicuous, as we pointed out editorially a few weeks ago, that competent opinion, swinging first from the idea of German guilt to that of mutual guilt, is keeping right on to that conclusion of Franco-Russian guilt which will undoubtedly be the settled conclusion of posterity. These books are the latest witness of the change from right to left, with G. Lowes Dickinson pointing the way and Harry Elmer Barnes registering with abundant scholarship and smashing power the final verdict against the Allied conspirators in Paris and St. Petersburg. If any last word were needed to banish the illusions and lies of German guilt, this word is here on a hundred different pages.

Mr. Dickinson's book has been hailed, and rightly hailed, as a masterpiece of the first order. It is in substance a rewriting, in the light of the great mass of documents revealed to the startled world since 1918 (when the Bolsheviks began the publication of the archives of the Czar's foreign office), of the same author's "The European Anarchy," which appeared in 1915. The argument is in effect the same, with all the added power of an almost miraculous piece of surmise or suspicion impressively transformed into a sober and tragic piece of historical demonstration. What Mr. Dickinson saw at the start, in other words, with amazing prevision, he now knows as a matter not of faith but of fact. His case, as stated in his original book, is now proved.

From the beginning, as now in this latest work, Mr. Dickinson has been concerned not primarily with assessing guilt and weighing responsibility, as regards either individuals or nations, but with portraying a situation in which individuals and nations were all alike involved. He looks out upon a world of confusion and disorder, in which, under jungle law, selfish governments seek selfish ends by methods of secrecy, deception, force, and ultimate violence. In the rivalry of jealous nationalisms and competing imperialisms, controlled by no restraint but that of safety shrewdly estimated on the basis of chance, he discovers a tension of balanced power, competitive armaments, wars and rumors of wars, which ultimately breaks out into universal combat as it did in 1914 and will again a decade or a quarter-century hence. The actual details of the tangled history of the years prior to Sarajevo are all here—Morocco, Algeciras, Bosnia, the Bagdad Railway, etc., etc. But these all become more and more, as the book develops, mere threads, so to speak, in one great pattern of doom which engulfs the world in ruin. Yet is Lowes Dickinson no fatalist! He knows that men were responsible for the final disaster—the statesmen of Russia, France, Germany, Austria, England; that the War could have been prevented by these occupants of the seats of power as it was precipitated by them. In nothing is this book so valuable as in its depiction of these famous leaders—Isvolsky, Poincaré, Sazonof, Delcassé, the Kaiser, Viscount Grey—petty, feeble men, never knowing what they were doing, but dishonest always, and always ready to use men as pawns in the great game of empire. If Dickinson saves many of these men from the horrid guilt imposed upon them by Morel yesterday and by Barnes today, it is at the expense of their last shred of reputatoin for competence and good intent. What a picture—a world driven to disaster and death by men remarkable for nothing but their guile! In such a picture, inaccurate only in the sense that it can, perhaps must, be painted so much blacker, there is of course left nothing of the fantasy of a wicked and designing Germany leaping madly upon an innocent, unsuspecting, unprepared and peaceful Allied World. From no honest and informed point of view is that silly fable any longer tenable.

"Isvolsky and the World War" is by a German, Frederick Stieve. It is frankly and openly an advocate's plea for the Central Powers as ever against the Entente in the matter of responsibility for the War. Dr. Stieve does not pretend to be impartial—does not want to be impartial. He believes that France and Russia were guilty, as Germany was innocent—is certain that he has the evidence to prove it—and proceeds to present this evidence. The book is in no sense, however, a raving screed of blind, fanatical partisanship. It is dignified, scholarly, restrained—but always a brief for the defense of his country. Such a book has all the disadvantages of an *ex parte* statement—but it also has all the advantages! Thus, this is the strongest case, presumably, that can be made out against France and Russia as the guilty parties—here is all that can be said in the indictment of those governments. That the case is strong, the indictment con-

*(1) "International Anarchy," by G. Lowes Dickinson. Published by the Century Company.
(2) "Isvolsky and the World War," by Frederick Stieve. Published by Alfred A. Knopf.
(3) "The Limitations of Victory," by Alfred Fabre-Luce. Published by Alfred A. Knopf.
(4) "The Genesis of the World War," by Harry Elmer Barnes. Published by Alfred A. Knopf.

vincing, is putting it mildly. We would like to see it answered, that is all.

If we look for confirmation of Dr. Stieve's brief, we find it abundantly in the books by Alfred Fabre-Luce and Harry Elmer Barnes. In "The Limitations of Victory" we have a Frenchman going over the same ground judiciously, impartially, soberly, with no desire to prove anything but the truth, and coming out to practically the same conclusion. He is willing to see, as he must see, a larger German and Austrian share in the bloody mess than Dr. Stieve is willing to concede, but he is himself forced to concede, all the same, the dominant responsibility of Poincaré, Isvolsky and their associates in Paris and St. Petersburg. It is amazing to find a Frenchman writing in this detached fashion, and thus illustrating in his own person the fulfillment of his prophecy that the time will come "when science and patriotism will have their separate domains." That M. Fabre-Luce is convincing goes without saying. Already, before Poincaré completes his memoirs, he has been answered for all time by his own countryman.

As for Professor Barnes' work, "The Genesis of the World War," there are few words adequate to describe its brilliancy and power. As a sheer *tour de force*, it is unparalleled by anything we have encountered in our experience. From the scholarly point of view, the book is impregnable. Professor Barnes has studied all the documents, read all the memoirs, and here they are, chapter, verse, and line. From the literary point of view, the book is again matchless. The author writes with superb clarity and passion. He has abundant heat, as he rages against the propagandist lies of the war-period, but this at no sacrifice of light. He masses his data, gathered out of so tremendous an accumulation of material, with magnificent effectiveness — a little repetition, inevitable in his scheme, but everything with a place and everything in this place. Withal there is a narrative ardor, a thrill of mere story telling, which makes the reading of the book an absorbing experience. The whole work is popular in the best sense of the word, with no sacrifice of scientific accuracy and authority. Again and again Barnes reminds us of the immortal Huxley for his combination of exact knowledge with popular speech, his love of truth, his immense scorn of ignorance, prejudice, and stupidity, his joy in battle, and his will to victory.

Professor Barnes' interpretation of pre-War events is perfectly simple. The immediate causes of the War, as distinguished from the remote and basic causes which Professor Barnes amply recognizes, he finds in their inception at the joining of hands of Poincaré and Isvolsky, respectively French premier and Russian ambassador at Paris, in January, 1912. From this time on we have a plan, a plot, a conspiracy, for the isolation of Germany, the acquirement of Constantinople and the Straits by Russia and of Alsace and Lorraine by France, with the fomenting of Balkin disturbances as the occasion for launching war against Germany for her destruction. Into this plot were dragged England and later Italy. The necessary Balkan crisis was precipitated at the favorable moment by the murder of the Austrian Arch-Duke with the connivance of the Serbian military and civil authorities. The conspiracy unfolded itself with awful rapidity in the next three weeks, with Russia casting the die of conflict by her mobilization on July 30th. Thus does Professor Barnes carry us from the one pole of German guilt to the opposite pole of Franco-Russian guilt. No middle ground for him! And he seems to prove his case. The evidence is not yet all in, of course. The British documents, now being studied by Messrs. Gooch and Temperley, have yet to be published, and the French archives will probably remain hidden for years. But it is difficult to imagine how they can do other than confirm and strengthen what Professor Barnes has here laid down. It is the opinion of no less a scholar than Professor Ferdinand Schevill, of Chicago University, as stated in the *Christian Century* (June 17, page 778), that Professor Barnes' "case must in all its essential features be held as proved." "The bulk of the book," he concludes, "will probably stand the test of time."

What a whirligig of change in a few short years! Recall the days, if you can, when Germany was "the mad dog of Europe," when Germans were "Huns," when the Kaiser was Satan returned to hurl his black legions against the shining ramparts of heaven. "No single document of the hundreds brought to light since 1918," says Professor Schevill, "has given the least substantiality" to this picture. On the contrary, we know now that just the opposite was true—that Germany was the victim and France and Russia, the arch-conspirators.

Of course, at bottom, the devil-theory of human events, whether applied to Germany or to the Allies, is shallow and superficial. Here Lowes Dickinson is right—it was political anarchy and economic rivalry and not wicked men on either side which brought about disaster. But Professor Barnes is also right when he points out that vast impersonal forces of this kind do not "operate independently of the individual actors in the historic drama." The gun, in other words, has a trigger, and somebody pulls it; the explosion is set off by a match, and somebody scratches it. From this standpoint, there is personal responsibility involved in every such event as the World War. And in this War the responsibility lies with an overwhelming burden of guilt upon the Allies.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Correspondence

President Coolidge and the League of Nations

Editor of UNITY:

President Coolidge in his Memorial Day address at Arlington said some wholesome and necessary things. He urged cooperation for "a more abiding peace," and said, "Other nations ought to join with us in laying aside their suspicions and hatreds sufficiently to agree among themselves upon methods of mutual relief from the necessity of the maintenance of great land and sea forces. This can not be done if we constantly have in mind the resort to war for the redress of wrongs and the enforcement of rights."

This is true; and the one and only substitute for the resort to war for the settlement of international disputes is international organization. This has been clearly seen and proclaimed by all great international leaders from the time of Cobden and Sumner. The American delegates to the great peace congresses in Europe in the middle of the last century urged with such emphasis and persistence international federation, with an international congress and an international court, as the one means of terminating the resort to war, that their plea and program was universally hailed as "the American way." Now Europe and the rest of the world have adopted "the American way" and the United

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion."

PEACE RESOLUTIONS

Complete text of Resolutions unanimously passed by meeting of churchmen in Chicago, June 10th and 11th last, under auspices of World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.

Preamble

The friends of international peace are increasing. The forces for peace are growing. Yet the peace movement never faced a more critical situation. Its urgent need at this hour is for unity of principles and coordination of programs. Lack of harmony may cause irreparable loss in this our greatest social and moral crusade. We therefore commend the world alliance for calling this conference to promote a more coherent attitude of the advocates of peace.

We recognize that the approaches to a warless world are varied. We are still in the process of finding the most feasible paths to peace. We do not desire to be dogmatic as to details of policy. But the danger of drifting into war situations is so obvious, the silent forces which lead to international crisis are so subtle, the delay of constructive action is so disheartening that we summon the proponents of peace to a sympathetic understanding of differing programs and to a united advance on certain great essentials.

We believe that the churches and other religious organizations have in the peace movement a most searching opportunity of their history. Religious groups must translate their ideals of a warless world into effective action through intelligent understanding of the political, social and economic problems facing the nations, and through support of practical measures to ensure international cooperation and justice.

We believe that the promotion of present day international peace is a supremely important function of present day citizenship and statesmanship. We deprecate all intolerance which tends to limit the freedom of speech in the discussion of matters so vital to this country.

Resolutions

1. We believe that war should no longer be used for the settlement of controversies between nations. Without questioning the right of self defense as inherent and inalienable for all individuals and nations, we believe that a combined and frontal attack for the overthrow of the war system, which is force and violence, by making war a crime under the law of nations, should be the unifying purpose and dominating motive of all peace groups. We recognize the need of embodying this outlawry of war in a progressive codification of international law.

2. We believe that the ultimate membership of the United States in the permanent court of international justice will be, under satisfactory conditions, one of the immediately practicable steps in the direction of cooperation for the settling of disputes between nations on the basis of law instead of war. To stop at this stage, however, would be to fall short of the necessary cooperation which can give effect to the sincere efforts of those nations now striving for the adoption of peaceful methods through the league of nations, the Locarno pact, arbitration treaties and affirmative jurisdiction of the world court. If we are to make effective this important step, we must be prepared through education and organization to enlarge the field of common endeavor.

3. We believe that some form of world organization is necessary as a pacific substitute for the war system. We recognize the league of nations as the only such organization. We rejoice that its great services in the fields of humanitarian endeavor have enlisted the cooperation of our own country. We believe that this country should study the ways and means by which we can cooperate more effectively in the activities of the league of nations for world peace.

4. We rejoice in the rapid extension of arbitration agreements and allied forms of peaceful settlement among European countries. We call attention to the extent and importance of this movement by which more than one nation has agreed to submit every possible case of international dispute to its appropriate tribunal, not even reserving questions of national honor and vital interest. We would urge the government of the United States to participate in this movement to the end that it may resume its place among the leaders in this important field of war prevention.

5. Practical steps should be taken to reduce armaments. This reduction should be progressive in order to keep pace with changing international situations. It should be made by successive international agreements through conferences to be called at definitely recurring intervals. Since this reduction and limitation of armament applies primarily to the established military, air and naval forces, it still leaves unsolved the further question of the potential armaments in chemical or industrial development. In this field, which is a vital element in national security, there is no known effective device for disarmament, by reduction or limitation, which does not strike at legitimate peace enterprises. The only way to eliminate this potential menace is to eliminate the war system itself.

6. We believe that in the case of war between states which have accepted tests of aggression as applying between themselves, the United States should not so interpret its neutral rights of private trade in munitions of war as to become the accomplice of an aggressor, self-confessed by the violation of its own covenants.

7. While fully appreciating the expediency of maintaining an adequate military and naval defense so long as the war system lasts, we are opposed to any tendencies which put undue emphasis on militarism in education. In particular we oppose compulsory military training in public schools, colleges and universities, except in institutions established for the specific purpose of military education.

8. We believe that immediate and specific measures for peace must be supplemented and safeguarded by a process of education. We commend the organizations which have set themselves to this task. We are particularly gratified that the churches of America have undertaken in the recent study conference at Washington, to formulate courses of study in peace education. We summon our schools and colleges, our civic and fraternal societies, our pulpit, our press, our theatre and other agencies of public opinion to enlist more earnestly in this campaign of education. To this end we dedicate ourselves anew.

AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR RELIEF OF RUSSIAN CHILDREN

The General Strike in England has taught us all something.

Most of all, it has taught us that *if we stick by each other* we can do things that a hundred years ago—yes, ten years ago—nobody would have dreamed could have been done.

When Abraham Lincoln said: "The strongest bond of human sympathy outside the family relation should be one uniting all working people of all nations, tongues and kindreds," he knew that the future and the safety of Labor depended upon the solidarity of Labor.

In Russia, there are half a million children—children of workers—city workers and farm workers—whose

---

States alone among the great nations holds back, although it was at the initiative of our own President that the united nations adopted the program for the world in the Paris treaty of 1919.

What does President Coolidge mean by saying: "Europe has the League of Nations. That ought to be able to provide those countries with certain political guarantees, which our country does not require." Why does it not require them, except for the fact that the rest of the world is organized to preserve peace? Why do we not do our part to make the political guaranties stronger for the rest of the world? What would Jefferson and the founders of the republic say to this attitude and tone of patronage instead of partnership toward our sister nations in the great family? Our patronage and aloofness unhappily are accompanied by more militaristic talk, more persistent pleas for "preparedness" for war, and more disparagement of the peace party than exists in any of the great European nations; and we maintain a navy as large as that of Great Britain, when our situation does not sanction one half so large.

So far from the League of Nations being a "European" institution, not half of the nations in the League are European nations—26, to be exact. Among the members of the League are 18 American nations, all of the American nations except Ecuador, Mexico and the United States.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

Boston, Mass.

Live Dangerously—But Know How

The tragedy of the human race is not over-eating so much as wrong combinations. A good meal can be spoiled by a glass of milk, and not only is your money wasted but you suffer indigestion. Read the HEALTH MESSENGER, the only magazine teaching the science of Iriology or How to Tell Your Own Condition by Studying the Colors of the Human Eyes. The smallest and snappiest health journal published today, the rebel of the healing world, 25 cents a copy, $1.50 a year.

STOP DIGGING YOUR GRAVE WITH YOUR TEETH

Learn the chemistry of food in a popular manner. Learn why bread is an acid producer and baked potatoes are alkaline. Read HEALTH-NATURE'S PRECIOUS GIFT—The most remarkable book written on the philosophy of food. Price 50 cents.

WHY DON'T MEN SUFFER WITH GOITRE AS OFTEN AS WOMEN?

If goitre is due to lack of Iodine, then men should suffer the same as women because they drink the same water and eat the same food. Read GOITRE—BEWARE OF THE KNIFE by Dr. J. D. Levine, and learn the causes and cure of goitre. Price 50 cents.

DO YOU KNOW THAT BRAN IS A DANGEROUS FOOD?

That it can produce a nervous shimmy in some people?

If you do not, then read BOMBSHELLS—The most stimulating booklet ever written. It is loaded with intellectual dynamite. Full of snappy articles on Life and Health. Price 50 cents.

For sale at all dealers or by mail from

The Health Messenger

Dept. Un. 1 162 N. State Street Chicago

Special Offer—Health Messenger for 1 year and 3 booklets for $2.50

"The Seven Deadly Sins of Militarism"

An Address by
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Single copies, 10 cents; twelve copies, $1; postpaid

Other Addresses by Mr. Holmes:
"Is Roman Catholicism a Menace to America?"
"Today's Challenge to the Jew: Advance or Retreat."
"Thomas Paine: Political and Religious Revolutionist."
"The Problem of the Unmarried"
"Great Possessions: What Are They?"
"Neglected Pleasures."
10 cents a copy, postpaid

Address: Secretary,
The Community Church
12 Park Avenue, New York City

parents perished during the war and the famine. They are helpless because they *know no trade*—they are outcasts, vagabonds—not because they want to be, but because in the great upheaval that has taken place in Russia, *they* have been the victims.

These children are a large part of the future workers of Russia. In a few years, the fate of *Labor* in Russia will be in their hands—and just now their hands are empty and unskilled.

We want to teach some of these kids trades—to take them off the streets and the roads and teach them to be workers, proud of their labor. We want to maintain a model training school for these orphans—so as to show the way for thousands like them, all over Russia. We want to show them that *Labor takes care of its own.*

Will you help? Will you, personally, or your Union, send us a contribution for this work of solidarity, of humanity, and of justice? Send your check *now* to the American Committee for Relief of Russian Children, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

PAXTON HIBBEN,
Executive Secretary.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove
Tel. Atlantic 1876

JULY

With its tennis and golf, its motoring and yachting days in the great out doors, makes unusually important the condition of your sports and outing apparel. Quick service so often a necessity finds expression here in our dispatch cleansing by the most approved of scientific methods.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor—large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Your health, and the health of your entire family will be benefited by a daily glass of

Bowman DAIRY COMPANY Milk!

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.